



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and shall continue in force for a period of five years; and it shall thereafter remain in force until twelve months after one of the high contracting parties have given notice to the other of an intention to terminate it.

"In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty and have affixed thereunto their seals.

"Done in Washington on the seventh day of August, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirteen."

A Typical Case.

We take pleasure in printing the following statement of belief recently received from a distinguished gentleman of the South. We have sent this statement to a number of well-known persons, with the request that they send for publication their conception of a proper reply. Four typical replies are given. We hope that others may be led to express their opinions.—THE EDITOR.

THE STATEMENT.

"Of course, as a Christian, I believe in peace and in doing all we can to bring about peace. But I do not believe that the United States, for example, ought to disband its army and navy. We must be subtle as serpents as well as simple as doves. What I believe about nations is parallel with what I believe about the internal affairs of the State: I am not a Tolstoian. I do not believe that when our Lord said, for example, 'Resist not evil,' that he was talking to policemen, but to the church. I think that we ought to have policemen and preachers of the gospel, too. When our Lord said, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's,' He created, it seems to me, a division of labor between the State, which requires a certain measure of physical force, and the church, which relies on spiritual power alone. So it seems to me as regards the relations between nations. Armies and navies are the police power of the nations. The world has not yet reached that stage of development in which we can dispense with physical force. And I believe that just as God himself did not disapprove of war—at least did not say that he did—during Old Testament times, the times of preparation for the coming of the Christ, so today, outside of the church, things are permissible and necessary which are not ideal. And I feel perfectly sure that the Peace Society will keep us back from peace and not bring us nearer to it unless that society shows a common-sense and a recognition of the necessity and righteousness of war under some circumstances. I believe that the cause of peace will be best promoted by the United States if, along with the growth of faith in moral and spiritual forces, we keep up a good army and navy which we use only in a righteous way.

"I shall be very glad to join your society and help all that I can if these principles are not considered heretical by the society. I should like very much to be informed of the attitude of the society toward the points that I have raised. It may be that this attitude has already been expressed, and, if so, I should like to know what it is. If the question has not been passed upon, I would like to have an authoritative statement on the subject."

Ex-President Charles W. Eliot writes:

"Wars and preparations for war inevitably continue,

because many of the effective causes of war in time past are still in full operation. The peace societies should, I think, recognize frankly the present necessity of maintaining in all countries armed forces for protective duty against aggressions from without or disintegration from within. They might wisely admit that war, although always a horrible evil, sometimes rights wrongs, secures rights, or results in some good—even unintended and unimagined good. They should then labor to eradicate the causes of war, namely, oppressions, miseries, illusions, and hatreds. To this end they should rely chiefly on the slow-acting forces of education, sanitation, and conservation, on the promotion of mutual acquaintance and advantageous commercial intercourse among nations with the resultant good will. They should create, or support, agencies competent to reduce, relieve, or prevent, so far as is each day possible, the consequences of governmental wrongdoings, widespread distresses, and natural catastrophes. They should foster the religious sentiments and the economic, industrial, legal, and political ethics which manifestly tend to purify and strengthen family life, to make the industries by which mankind lives productive and wholesome, and to secure domestic joys, public tranquillity, and the people's health, morality, and general well being."

Hon. Jackson H. Ralston, the well-known international lawyer, says:

"Without discussing the true interpretation of the Scriptures, it seems quite probable for some time to come that an army, or, preferably, I think, a militia, will be needed for police purposes. These police purposes involve keeping order at home, and do not involve the chastisement of other people into accepting our ideals of civilization. We have no need of an army or navy for self-defense, because there does not exist any nation sufficiently foolish to attack us, at least so long as we remain where we belong on this side of the seas. We have no business to have an army or navy big enough for aggression, and if we conduct our internal affairs with justice our use for armed force for the preservation of order will be reduced to a vanishing point."

Mr. Hamilton Holt, editor of the *Independent*, expresses his views as follows:

"Your 'distinguished gentleman of the South' raises a great many issues that are worth discussing. I think, however, his chief difficulty results from confusing a battleship with a policeman. A policeman uses only a minimum amount of force to bring the culprit before the court, where the law takes its orderly course. The function of a battleship, however, as a strenuous ex-President has said, is 'to pound the enemy into insensibility,' and then of course there is nothing left for the law to do. Armies and navies are not 'police power of nations,' except in an incidental sense. They are primarily intended to exert the will of a nation by force rather than by reason in a realm where other nations are equally sovereign.

"Of course the United States should not disband its army and navy until there is some sort of a 'United Nations' to preserve the peace between the forty-six nations, as the United States does between the forty-eight

States. When the League of Peace arrives, as it surely will, the United States can disband its army and navy, as the State of New York and the State of Virginia did when they joined the Union. At present the international realm is unorganized. It is the problem of the peace movement to organize it on the basis of law. As we progress toward this goal we should synchronously reduce our armaments; otherwise we shall witness the paradox of the rates of peace insurance going up while the risks are going down."

A gentleman from Chicago, whose formal contribution has not yet arrived, writes in answer to a second letter:

"About that Southern 'Christian' who believes in war: Yes, I received your letter. Such things stir me to the very foundations. I have an ever-deepening horror of bloody 'Christians.' To me a 'Christian' murderer is no more impossible than a 'Christian' supporter of the war system. If it is not too late, and you still wish it, I can write two hundred words with as much self-restraint as I can command. But it will be radical, and not strengthen the peace society's standing with 'judicial' people, I fear."

The German Free School and the Peace Movement.

(Die Frei Schulgemeinde.)

By Dr. Gustav Wyneken.

The author of the following article founded the famous German Free School at Wickersdorf, in Thuringia, in 1906. The enterprise has met with such success that he is now engaged in establishing a much larger school of the same character at Triberg, in the Black Forest, where he is receiving the moral support of the progressive government of Baden. Pacifists are interested in this movement because of the fact that the rest of the secondary education in Germany is at present in the complete power of the militarists. It lends interest to the article to know that Dr. Wyneken was dismissed from one of the regular secondary schools by the government of Saxe-Meiningen a few years ago on account of his progressive peace ideals.—THE EDITOR.

The international peace movement has met with a powerful enemy in the German Empire, in a field where it was least expected—that is, the field of education. While the prime purpose of education is to conquer the primitive and barbaric instincts of mankind, education in Germany has betrayed civilization at the present time by openly advocating and setting ablaze latent warlike instincts.

The national pan-Teutonic character revealed by the method of teaching history in practically all the German schools has long been known. The German college teacher has been the supreme example of the boasting Teuton. Within the past two or three years, however, this evil tendency has assumed an especially serious and dangerous form. Not content with imposing these false conceptions upon the youth in the actual teaching, the war party has taken possession of their free time and play, in order that unconsciously they might become permeated with the national spirit.

This dangerous development began with the founding of the Young German League (Jung Deutschland Bund). The ostensible object was to fit the youth for military service by physical training, military games, etc. But from the beginning there has never been any

doubt of the political activity of the league in furthering the purpose of the pan-Teutonic chauvinism.

This Young German movement spread through the secondary schools with the rapidity of an epidemic, and has already united a half million youth under its banner. The league is supported by the government by means of large subventions, and is promoted in every possible way by the military and the school authorities. It enjoys the protection of princes and of generals. Its chief source of strength, however, lies in the fact that it offers in contrast to the monotonous and hated school work an activity which brings them pleasure and which they can believe to be serious and vital or important.

The dangers of this new Young German movement should not be underestimated. Instead of a new generation growing up to create a people ruled by higher instincts and a strong will to create a higher culture and civilization, barbarism raises its head suddenly among them.

From all indications, the youth, who should be the creators of a more progressive age, will be more reactionary than the older generation.

How can this danger be met? The answer must be, of course, by reforming the school system. The first step is to reform the teaching. In place of the national teaching of history, the instruction must work toward inculcating the conviction that the spreading and deepening of civilization and the humanities is the task of mankind and the essence of history. The new instruction should further give a deep insight into the present social and economic interdependence of the nations and thereby automatically make clear the folly of war.

But such an intellectual reform of education in the secondary schools is not sufficient because nationalism is much more a matter of feeling than of reasoned conviction. The sources of wrong feeling can only be reached by drawing into service the emotions and the will. There must be created the same enthusiasm for the peaceful co-operation of nations and the raising of the level of human civilization as is now created for war and the policy of the mailed fist. But this enthusiasm must not remain theoretical and abstract, but it must have an opportunity to transform itself into action just as the Young German League gives to its members the opportunity to take a practical part in the warlike exercises.

This second problem of education reform, namely, the participation of the youth in really serious work, is much more difficult than the reform of the teaching of history and has not as yet even been attempted.

It cannot be hoped under present conditions that the educational reform in the public schools above outlined will be carried out by the State. Therefore, only one way is possible; public opinion must be awakened and must exert a continual pressure on legislative and controlling bodies.

Moreover, a new generation of teachers and educators must be trained to take hold of the task of educational reform. Both these things can only be partially attained by literary propaganda. Since this suffers from the prejudice against doctrines and purely theoretical reasoning, only by a practical example can the new educational ideal be demonstrated to the public; only through the witness of a new concrete fact can faith and enthusiasm be generated.